





*L. E. Geard*

# A BRIEF REVIEW

OF THE

“FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

WITH THE

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING,

MAY 6TH, 1834.”

ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

---

BY DAVID M. REESE, M. D.

OF NEW YORK.

---

New York:

PUBLISHED BY HOWE & BATES,  
BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

68½ Chatham-street.

1834.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in August, 1834, by DAVID M. REESE, in  
the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New York.

---

## PREFACE.

---

In the preparation of the present pamphlet, it will be perceived that the author has confined his criticisms to the contents of the First Annual Report of the Anti-slavery Society, and the addresses accompanying it. This course was deemed the most appropriate at present, although he is thereby prevented from introducing much collateral testimony, on the several topics introduced; and also, has to deny himself, from attempting such a vindication of the American Colonization Society, as that noble institution merits. As however the friends of "immediate abolition," profess to regard the American Anti-slavery Society as a *rival* institution, if he has succeeded in convicting this, their first official manifesto, of the political heresies, and moral obliquities, of which he accuses its authors; it need not be a subject of regret, that the specific character and high claims of the Colonization scheme, be, for the present, left to their own intrinsic evidence, or transferred to other and abler hands.

Although it is understood, that the pamphlet of which this is a brief review, has been extensively and gratuitously circulated, yet it is possible, that the present notice of it, may fall into the hands of some, who have never seen that publication. To such the author would say, that the few quotations which are selected from the "Report" and the "speeches" under notice, are less than a moiety of those offensive and exceptionable parts, with which its readers must be struck, and exhibiting a kindred spirit of delusion and fanaticism. Indeed it is highly probable that many who have read the Report, will feel surprised that other extravagances than those named have not been selected for animadversion. The limits however, of this brief review, would not suffice for much greater amplification, even had we time or inclination to be more minute. We have been content with selecting a few prominent features of the publication, exhibiting the scope and spirit of the

whole performance, that those who have not had the patience to read it, may nevertheless judge correctly of its character and tendency.

But for the recent popular ferment and commotion, into which the minds of our citizens have been thrown, by the practical development of Anti-slavery measures, and the public indignation consequent thereon, this review would have appeared immediately after the publication of the Report, with the design, that if an adequate antidote is here furnished, it might accompany the poison. Such however has been the state of the public mind, that most persons have been disqualified for calm and deliberate judgment, on the points involved in the agitation of the elements, and therefore it has been withheld. And now, when it is fairly presumable, that the reign of reason and dispassionate judgment has been restored, and before any new or offensive attitude has been taken by the misguided men, who have brought upon themselves and others these public calamities; it would seem that it is a fit time to canvass their doctrines, and if possible explode their errors. Believing that this can now be done prudently and safely, and without any probability of contributing to the renewal of the lawless outrages, which we all deplore, however much we may deprecate the causes which have furnished the pretext for such enormities, the present time has been chosen for our publication. And we confess that we would fain be timely and early in our remonstrance with the authorities of the Anti-slavery Society, lest they should mistake the opposition deeply felt in this whole community, for a mere irrational effervescence among the ignorant and depraved, and deceive themselves into the delusion that they are persecuted for righteousness sake; for if the latter impression should unhappily be taken, and if these bewildered men, should attempt a renewal of their offensive meetings and addresses in this city, or indeed any where else in the land, from mistaken views of Christian duty, we greatly fear that they would involve themselves and their fellow citizens in still greater calamities.

As men, as citizens, and as Christians, we would be criminally unmindful of the golden rule, and of our obligations to them, in all these relations, if we did not affectionately and earnestly admonish them, that the public mind is not, and cannot be, prepared to listen to the doctrines they advocate, whatever evidence they think they have of their own patriotism, philanthropy, and Christianity. Nor can they hope to find any permanent solace, in the self-complacency which accompanies the innocent, under unrighteous persecution. If they are Christians, they should remember that their Divine Master once

said, "I have many things to say to you but ye cannot *bear* them yet," and when his voice was drowned by a public clamour, he "went out from among them," and he charged his disciples even when "persecuted in one city, to flee to another." And if their Lord, who "*knew* what is in man," thus spake and thus acted, surely they should take "the world as it is, and not as they think it ought to be," if they would be "followers of Him."

Let it not be supposed, however, that in thus reasoning with these mistaken and misguided men on their own ground, we abate a single iota of the censure and reprobation which we have attempted to show is justly merited by the attitude they have taken. We believe they are radically wrong in their theorizing, and by consequence, radically wrong in their practice, and this we have attempted to prove in the following pages. Still, to their *persons* we feel nought but good will, while for their *errors* we have no more charity than for sin in any other form. In the discharge of our duty to them, and the cause of patriotism and religion, we have therefore spoken plainly and fearlessly, as one that must give an account. "What I have written, I have written."

THE AUTHOR.





A B R I E F R E V I E W  
OF THE  
"FIRST ANNUAL REPORT  
OF  
THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY," &c.

---

As the pamphlet entitled "The First Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society," &c., and containing a detailed account of the proceedings at the anniversary meeting, has been published *by the society, and circulated by its agents*, the public may surely regard its contents as an *official* promulgation of its doctrines and designs. The members and friends of that society cannot therefore justly complain of being identified with this published document, nor of being held responsible at the bar of *public opinion* for the sentiments thus officially acknowledged and publicly avowed. In the present animadversion, therefore, upon the contents of *their own pamphlet*, they cannot allege that sentiments or principles are ascribed to them which they do not hold; nor can they justly complain of the "misrepresentations of their enemies." It is for this reason that the writer declines to offer any remarks on other, and semi-official publications, such as those with which, for some months past, the land has been deluged. And though reference be occasionally made to the opinions and conduct of individuals, leading members of the anti-slavery societies, it will be done for the purpose of illustrating the doctrines of the pamphlet under review; and then, *only* when such individuals are fully sustained in that publication. This course is taken in order that no injustice or unfairness may be alleged, and that the cause of "*immediate abolition*," and the project of a forced and unnatural elevation of the African race, as taught and insisted on by "the American Anti-Slavery Society," may be weighed in the balances of even handed *justice*, and impartially tried before the majesty of *truth*.

The writer avows himself to be the uncompromising enemy of *slavery*, and the friend of *universal emancipation*, in this and in every land; and therefore regards the existing *system of*

*slavery* as a legitimate subject of discussion through the pulpit or the press, provided that discussion be *peaceably conducted*; and provided also, that the genius of our *government* and the principles of our *civil compact* be neither *assailed* nor *impugned* in such discussions.

As an *American*, he is heartily a believer in the doctrines of the "Declaration of Independence;" and, at the same time, firmly and indissolubly attached to the "Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the States," as well as "the Constitution of the United States," upon which the perpetuity and the very existence of our glorious union depends. As a *Christian*, he recognises the paramount claims and authority of the divine law, and would fain render implicit obedience and unqualified submission to its requirements, and inculcate similar sentiments and practice upon others. And as a *human being*, he admits in all its length and breadth, the propriety and universality of that law of nature, which constitutes each individual of his fellow men, *a man and a brother*. But believing, as he most conscientiously and religiously does, that all these several relations can, and do, harmoniously and consistently coexist, and that the duties and obligations growing therefrom, do not in any wise conflict; he is therefore, after a thorough investigation of the whole subject, deliberately persuaded that the doctrines and practice of the American Anti-Slavery Society are utterly irreconcilable with the consistent character either of an American citizen or an American Christian. It is therefore that he advocates the abolition of slavery in the United States by *gradual* emancipation; and feels it to be a high and sacred duty both to oppose the project of *immediate abolition*, and to assist the American Colonization Society, which presents the only discoverable plan of consistently and peacefully promoting the *gradual and ultimate abolition of slavery*, and the only rational project of elevating the character and condition of the coloured population of the United States; in which, as *American* citizens, philanthropists, and Christians, we can safely unite.

The writer therefore utterly disclaims the allegation of being either an advocate or apologist for slavery; for he never had, or can have, any personal or individual interest, pecuniary or otherwise, either in the system of slavery or in the success of the colonization cause. As a *citizen of the United States*, however, he cannot be an indifferent spectator to the scenes which have recently transpired in the North, which threaten to "disturb our Union" precisely as predicted by "the Father of our country" in his "Farewell Address," when he warned his countrymen against arraying "the North against the South," as though, by prophetic

inspiration, he foreknew the present schemes of "*designing men*." And surely it would be affectation in any Christian to profess indifference to the unhappy tendencies already developed among fellow-professors of our common Christianity, by the recent attitude of the friends of "*immediate abolition*." It is therefore with the humble hope of being instrumental in exhibiting the *errors* of the American Anti-Slavery Society, both to its friends and enemies, and exposing to public view the direct and palpable *mischiefs of its tendency* both upon the free and the enslaved among our African population, as well as its Anti-American and Anti-Christian character, that the present task has been undertaken.

This then is an appeal to the understanding, the conscience, and the heart of every man and woman in this land, who values the *truth*, the *whole truth*, and *nothing but the truth*. The subject is one confessedly of absorbing interest, in every aspect, and ought to be calmly and dispassionately weighed in the light of facts, with the aid of enlightened reason and Divine revelation. We repeat, that it has become a subject of great and absorbing interest; and whether viewed *politically*, in its influence on the existence and destinies of our republican institutions; or *socially*, in its bearing upon the purity and happiness of our domestic relations; or *religiously*, in its connexion with the department of public morals, and public virtue; there can be no consistent neutrality on the part of any individual patriot, philanthropist, or Christian.

Slavery exists in our land, with all its attendant evils, physical and intellectual, political and moral—evils, too, which are scarcely capable of exaggeration. Its existence and its perpetuation by the will of state sovereignty, is provided for by the Constitution of the Union; and the protection of *slave property* is recognised by the laws of the land, as equally obligatory upon the several states *where slavery is abolished, as upon those where it exists*. And although we in the North have effected *voluntary* emancipation by the exercise of the powers vested in our state legislatures, yet our brethren of the South, in the exercise of the same *sovereignty*, not only choose to continue slavery among them as a system, but absolutely *prohibit emancipation*, except on condition of removal from the state. Such then is the political aspect of this great subject; and it is under such circumstances that "the American\* Anti-Slavery Society" insist

\* The title of *American* can with no more justice or propriety be applied to such a society as this obviously is in name and in fact, than to an *Anti-Liberty Society*; and for this plain reason, that the *liberty of the free* is not more amply guarded and fully secured by the *laws of the land*, than is the slavery of the

upon "*immediate abolition, without expatriation,*" in the language of the second article of their constitution. In the same article, they proclaim that "slave-holding is a *heinous crime* in the sight of God," and also award *their* decision, that "the *duty, safety, and best interests* of all concerned, require its *immediate abandonment.*" And of all this, they declare it is their "aim to convince all their fellow-citizens by *arguments* addressed to their *understandings and consciences.*" The character of these *arguments*, as exhibited in the pamphlet before us, will presently claim our notice, as well as the principles they are designed to enforce.

We therefore invite attention first to the report itself, which will be found to be one of the most extraordinary productions of modern date, not merely in its *dogmatism* and *declamation*, but in the *imposture* it attempts on the *public credulity*. After a few introductory remarks, the report commences by what we regard as an unparalleled insult to the understandings of our citizens, in the following preposterous assumption of being the *originators of sympathy* for the enslaved, of being the *exclusive discoverers* of the duty of *promoting emancipation!* We insert the whole paragraph, italicising the sentences most emphatic.

"In tracing the history of the present Anti-Slavery movements, we have *not far* to go in the records of the *past*. For though there have not been wanting, since the days of Benezet, individuals who have *occasionally* borne a noble testimony against slavery; yet their voices have been overborne and drowned; there has been *no devotion of life to the cause of reform, no concentration of effort, no kindling up of general sympathy, no mustering of hosts* against the monster. *Till the organization of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society in 1832, there was scarcely a rill of pity for the slave!* which was not diverted to the EXPATRIATION OF THE FREE. The formation of that Society, so much despised and derided, was the era of a mighty reformation. It led on to the Convention of the 4th of December, in Philadelphia.

enslaved. Both societies would be Anti-American in principle and tendency, because either is, in its very name, an infringement of our civil rights, a palpable assault upon the constitution of the country. It is plain then that those who thus conspire against the supreme authorities of the land, as well as the rights legitimately claimed under our laws by any portion of our fellow-citizens, however pure their motives or laudable their ultimate aim, do nevertheless endanger the very existence of our civil institutions, and sap the foundations of the noble edifice of American freedom.

*Then the standard was raised distinctly before the whole American people. The effect is as if an oppressive spell had been removed from the humanity of the nation. Men are every where awaking to the claim of two millions of their brethren in bondage,—they are astonished at their former prejudice, and blindness, and folly; they are girding on the armour of our victorious principles.”\**

Such presumptuous effrontery on the part of these novices in philanthropy, of these raw recruits in the cause of emancipation, if their insignificance did not forbid it, would subject them to the derision of the universe. As it is, it can only provoke a smile of contempt from every man of sense, to witness such consummate arrogance. They do indeed name the great and good *Benezet*, and allude to others as bearing a noble testimony *occasionally*

\* So then, “we are the people; and wisdom, and humanity too, will die with us;” for every rill of pity now felt for the slave, came into existence with them. In their innocent simplicity they seem to have forgotten, that all that *can* be done in the *free* states has been accomplished to their hands some years ago, by men of whom it used to be thought in old fashioned times, that their hearts were not altogether steeled against the impulses of humanity. It may not be within the knowledge of these newly fledged philanthropists, whose claims to this character bear date since 1832, that there once lived a gentleman in this country, a philanthropist somewhat distinguished in his day, by the name of Benjamin Franklin. He was a plain man, and studiously inostentatious in his deeds of benevolence. In 1785, he founded the Pennsylvania Manumission Society in the city of Philadelphia; and shortly after the New-York Manumission Society was instituted; and in New-Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, similar societies were organized, although these several states were then slave states, as well as New-York. The object was, to promote the abolition of slavery by peaceable means, and the subsequent improvement and elevation of the condition of the free, by the institution of schools. They held annual conventions, which are still continued. By judicious, gradual, and well directed efforts, they have effected the extinguishment of slavery in all the states north of Delaware. A succession of acts were passed at their instance by the Legislature of New-York, until, in 1817, an act of total abolition was passed, which took effect in 1827. In all the philanthropic operations of these benevolent men, so strangely underrated and overlooked, for we are here told there was *scarcely a rill of pity for the slave until 1832*; no outrage has been committed on the public peace, and the society enjoy the confidence of the benevolent public, in the South as well as the North.

For more than 30 years has the manumission school in this city been in successful operation. In maintaining these schools, the Manumission Society has been instant in season and out of season, and have succeeded in building up no less than eight free African male and female schools; so that through their efforts, ample provision has been made for the education of every coloured child in the city of New-York. For 10 years, moreover, has a standing committee of this Society watched over the rights of the fugitive slaves, and those who have been claimed in this city, and have investigated all cases down to the present day, provided and paid counsel, and also extended their care to all cases of free coloured people, who have been arrested in Southern states, and afforded them the protection of the laws. And yet these noble efforts, and the uniform labours of the Society of Friends collectively and individually employed, are all too insignificant to be named.

against slavery; but Lay, and Sandiford, and Woolman, and Franklin, who preceded Benezet; and Jay, and Tyson, and Rush, and *hundreds more* of sacred memory, who have since laboured in the same cause, are all annihilated in the mirror of self-complacency before which this huge Anti-Slavery Society is reflecting its gigantic proportions. And accordingly we find it made a matter of grave record, that there has been "*no devotion of life to the cause of reform, no concentration of effort, no kindling up of general sympathy*, and until the organization of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society in 1832! there was *scarcely a rill of pity for the slave*, which was not diverted for the expatriation of the free!" Such shameless extravagance and brazen untruths, would indicate the charitable imputation of insanity upon its authors, if we did not know, that an obliquity of mental vision, and an obtusity of moral feeling, that is allied to insanity in its developments, are often found to characterize every form of fanaticism.

If the representations here given of our country have any semblance of truth, the Christians of this land, in the past and present century, down to the year 1832, have been not merely involved in "the prejudice, and blindness, and folly" of which they are here accused, but they have possessed a savage brutality, and destitution of moral sense, which is not excelled by any instance of heathen barbarism. "*Scarcely a rill of pity for the slave*" was felt by philanthropists or Christians until 1832, which was not diverted to the expatriation of the free; and as this latter diversion was only proposed in 1816, up to that period there could have been *no pity!!* Indeed, we are here told that the removal of the "oppressive spell from the *humanity* of THE NATION," was the effect of "a Convention held on the 4th of December, 1833, at Philadelphia!!" since which portentous era, the Americans are "*awaking*" and "*astonished at their former prejudice, and blindness, and folly!*" The reader must not be shocked at learning the stupendous results of that Convention, for the first time, in this place; for the white population of the city where it met in December last, have yet to receive the intelligence of this august assemblage! Had the moral earthquake here described been anticipated, Philadelphia would not thus have so sadly overlooked the wonderful convulsion which produced so extraordinary phenomena!

After a narrative of the agencies employed, the number of publications issued, and the presses enlisted in "*drawing that arch deceiver from its hiding place*," meaning the American Colonization Society, the Report proceeds,—

"But we have still more occasion for gratitude to the God

of the oppressed, for the hold which our principles have taken in a number of colleges. It is an omen of immense good. It opens a sure path to the overthrow of slavery, not in name merely, but in all its fearful and varied realities. Let some of our higher institutions *trample on the cord of caste!* open their doors to all, *without distinction of complexion!* educate a number of talented *men of colour*, and show the world what sort of minds slavery crushes in the dust; and the spell is broken, prejudice gives way, and *two millions* of chains fall asunder."

Here it cannot be denied, that the doctrine of "amalgamation of the races," so frequently disclaimed, is manifestly broached; and accordingly, after referring to the Western Reserve College, and the Oneida Institute, in one of which there are two *coloured* students, and the other is understood to be *opened to the blacks*, it is significantly added, "We trust that the friends of the oppressed will not be slow to support an institution, which promises so much to the cause of *humanity* in its struggle with *prejudice* and the *foul spirit* of CASTE!" Here, then, the repugnance existing in our higher institutions of learning among professors and students, against mingling on terms of perfect equality with the blacks, is ascribed to *inhumanity, prejudice*, and the *foul spirit* of caste! And the two of the "*higher institutions*" here named, are represented as exclusively arrayed on the side of *humanity!*

But next we have the intelligence, that the students of the Lane Seminary, near Cincinnati, Ohio, have adopted the sentiments of the Society, and that "measures have been taken to establish a first rate seminary for *coloured females*, and a lady has been enlisted for an instructress, who lacks not talents to place the school among the first in the country." This last is a result highly honourable to all concerned, and one against which no opposition from any quarter need be apprehended, if the institution be not offensively located, and if it be unobjectionably conducted. It is difficult to see, however, the "*humanity*" of such a measure, on their own principles; for if this seminary be not composed of *white and coloured females*, "without distinction of complexion;" it will only be a standing and enduring monument of the "cruelty of prejudice," and "*the mightier and more cruel cord of caste!*"

The Report next refers to the laudable efforts of the free coloured people, by conventions, held among themselves at Philadelphia, and in the establishment of the Phœnix Society at

New-York, in terms of merited approbation ; though the connexion between such objects as the latter Society proposes with the present Anti-slavery movements is not so apparent.

The paragraph which follows, presents a clearer expression of the designs entertained and the hopes indulged, of the amalgamation of the races, in our literary institutions ; and distinctly avows that this is but an entering wedge to effecting the same result in every possible aspect.

“ These interesting facts lead us to some *important conclusions*, which, in passing, we cannot forbear to remark. There is no way to destroy the *prejudice* which lies at the foundation of slavery, but to *invite our coloured brethren to a participation with us in all those happy and elevating institutions* which are open to *others* ! No efforts, however powerful or well-intended, which aim only to build up *separate institutions* for their special benefit, under the denomination, *so odious to them* ! of “ *coloured*” or “ *African*,” can heal the wound. They will end only in conferring upon their objects a keener sensibility to insult, and in establishing between the races an animosity, settled and remediless. Providence seems most kindly to have opened before us the path of safety and success, in creating so strong an Anti-Slavery sentiment in many of our *most hopeful seminaries*. Let those vigorous institutions be opened, as we doubt not they will be, to youth, *irrespective of complexion*, and in ten years our country will number among its most talented sons, men of the sable hue—giants in intellect, who will smile as they shake off the green withes in which an absurd prejudice would confine them—who will not be overborne by insult, any more than the lion by the dew of the morning, which he shakes from his mane.”

Hereafter it will be utterly vain for the Society, or any of its officers or members, to enter a “ disclaimer of any design to promote or encourage amalgamation by intermarriages,” unless they disclaim *marriage* as being among “ *those happy and elevating institutions* which are open to *others* ;” for to ALL of these, without exception, it is declared to be indispensable that we “ *INVITE our coloured brethren to a participation with us* !” And accordingly, in our political, religious, and social relations, there must be no “ *distinction of colour*,” but they are to be open



to all, "irrespective of complexion!" Conventions, societies, and churches, now "under the denomination, so odious to them, of *coloured* or *African*," must be annihilated!! Has it never occurred to these wise men, that these "separate institutions" called "*coloured* or *African*," and therefore "*so odious to them*," are not a whit less odious, than the proposition of amalgamation in any of these aspects is to our white population? Is there no "criminal prejudice," in this odiousness of which the coloured people complain, because they are not invited to perfect equality with us, and because they are called "*coloured*" by way of distinction, or "*African*" in reference to their origin? And why do not these champions of anti-prejudice enlighten, reprove and reform these objects of their exclusive philanthropy? Surely they would find this "prejudice *vincible*" before the mighty weapons they use.

But if there remain any doubt, whether this Society does indeed design thus to prostrate every barrier which separates the races from free and unrestrained amalgamation, we refer to the 59th page of the pamphlet, for a demonstration that *both sexes* are distinctly included in the grossness of their delusion. The report adopts the following language,

"Let it be the glory of *our sons*, and DAUGHTERS!! to have been educated in seminaries, which were open to worthy applicants *without regard to complexion*, that the NEXT GENERATION may be disenthralled from those *narrow and despicable* prejudices which have trammelled the present."

Here is the outrageous proposition of these visionary enthusiasts, by which they fully declare their purpose, and if their unnatural objects could be attained, the *next generation* would indeed have potent and omnipotent reasons for being disenthralled, for we should then be a nation of mulattoes and mongrels. Such a proposition from any source, entitles its authors to the execration of their species.

If, however, we admit the supposition that they do not contemplate the amalgamation of the races by intermarriages, we think it is a legitimate and necessary inference from these avowals of their Report, that they are at least reckless and indifferent as to this result, and that they feel no repugnance to such a consequence, if it should follow. Indeed, if it were not irrelevant to our present purpose, we might here demonstrate, that intermarriage is the only possible way in which the African race can ever be elevated either to political or social equality with the whites, if both races are to occupy the same country. All history does not furnish an instance of such an elevation of a degraded population, by any other means. And who does not per-

ceive that the elevation of our coloured population in the United States above the relation and position they at present occupy, if ever effected, must be done in one of two ways? Either by placing them by themselves, in Africa or some other country, sufficiently remote from the United States, and thus constituting them into a distinct nation; or by consenting to the most unnatural and offensive amalgamation. All civil and political equality is founded upon social and domestic equality, and the universal experience of mankind will demonstrate, that intermarriage lies at the foundation of both. He therefore who aims at producing the former, in any aspect, must consent fully to the latter, whether it enter into his plans and purposes or not, since it is necessarily included: and hence, when any of those advocates of immediate emancipation who publicly disclaim the doctrine of *amalgamation*, are pressed in private conversation with the necessary and unavoidable connexion between *political* and *domestic* equality, and they are constrained to admit that the former cannot in the nature of things be attained without the latter; they will invariably agree, that if *intermarriages* must be allowed in order to the elevation of the coloured race, to equal rights, that elevation ought to be effected, without regard to consequences.

The fact that no white person ever did consent to marry a negro, without having previously forfeited all character with the whites, and that even profligate sexual intercourse between the races, every where meets with the execration of the respectable and virtuous among the whites, as the most despicable form of licentiousness; is of itself an irrefragable proof, that *equality* in any aspect in this country is neither practicable nor desirable. Criminal amalgamation, may and does exist among the most degraded of the species, but Americans will never yield the sanctions of law and religion to an equality so incongruous and unnatural.

The following are the sentiments of a transatlantic writer in a late number of the Phrenological Journal of Edinburgh, after conclusively arguing against the possibility of incorporating the races, between whom the God of nature has drawn a line of demarcation, broad, deep, and impassable; and rationally deducing from this strong and universal repugnance, a striking indication of the Divine intention, he says,

“It is wild fanaticism to call this repugnance ‘unchristian prejudice,’ and to denounce a doubt of the power of religion to overcome it as infidelity;—because God made all men of one flesh, and Christianity bids us open wide the arms of

brotherly love, and take all our brethren of mankind to our bosom. It is a stupid perversion of this religious precept to maintain, that the fulfilment of this duty precludes all *change* of the Negro's *place of residence*, and that the American does not in effect hold out to him the arms of brotherly love, by placing him in independence, comparative elevation, and abundance, in another country, instead of degradation and destitution where he is. God made all men of one flesh, but he did not design them all *to live in one country*, and, however various and unsuitable their aspect and nature, to mix and *incorporate*. If we look at that well marked and vast peninsula called Africa, we find that equally marked race, the Negro, with slight modifications, forming its native population throughout all its regions. We find the temperature of his blood, the chemical action of his skin, the very texture of his wool-like hair, all fitting him for the vertical sun of Africa; and if every surviving African of the present day who is living in degradation and destitution in other lands for which he was never intended, were actually restored to the peculiar land of his peculiar race, in independence and comfort, would any man venture to affirm that Christianity had been lost sight of by all who had in any way contributed to such a consummation? It matters not to brotherly love on which side of the Atlantic the Negro is made enlightened, virtuous, and happy, if he is actually so far blessed; but it does matter on which side of the ocean you place him, when there is *only one* where he will be as happy and respectable as benevolence would wish to see him, and certainly there a rightly applied morality and religion would sanction his being placed. The incurable evil of the present relation of the whites and the blacks in America is, that *incorporation* is almost *morally impossible*. The whites are too numerous in both the sexes, to be driven to intermarriage with the Negroes. Mulattoes are a West Indian, greatly more than an American phenomenon. The distinction in the United States is white or black, with little of the intervening shades of colour. The races *do not and will not incorporate*. Try the loudest advocates for the 'vincibility' of this prejudice, as it is most unphilosophically called, with this touchstone,—'marry the

Negresses to your sons, and give your daughters to Negroes,'—and we shall have a different answer from *Nature* than we receive from a misplaced religious profession."

We commend this paragraph to the sober intelligence and Christian consideration of all concerned. It was published in a review of the present controversy, as conducted in Great Britain by a certain Charles Stuart, the same who is now peregrinating through our country, and the notable Wm. Lloyd Garrison when in England, who unitedly employed themselves in impeaching the American Colonization Society, vilifying the American people, and calumniating that estimable and disinterested philanthropist, Mr. Elliot Cresson of Philadelphia, in his successful efforts to found the "British African Colonization Society."

But the triumphs on which the Report dwells with so much eloquence and zeal, are all inconsiderable in the estimation of its authors, in comparison with "another occurrence, long to be remembered," and which they term "the full and final exposure of the *Colonization delusion*." They indeed admit that the "scheme may be advocated a little longer '*on various pretences*,'" but they declare "as a practical matter it is *at an end*." "The *life and the soul* of the system has departed."

The following propositions they declare to be now proven in the light of facts, and unalterably and unquestionably established, viz. :

" 1. The colonization of the free has no tendency to diminish the number of the slaves !

2. The free coloured population are spontaneously and unanimously opposed to the scheme !

3. Colonies are not adapted to Christianize Africa !

4- Nothing but the prejudice of the *whites* renders the removal of the *blacks* at all desirable !

5. This prejudice is conquerable by the moral power of the gospel !"

We need only remark, that "in the light of facts," the 1st, 2d, and 3rd of these propositions, are both arithmetically and morally untrue, as must be obvious to every man of sense, white or coloured, who understands the rudiments of either arithmetic or morals. It would therefore be an insult to the understanding of the reader, to offer a single commentary on either of them, unless indeed he partake of kindred stupidity with the authors, and in that case he is incapable of exhibiting a demon-

stration of the abolition maxim of "Prejudice vincible," and our labour would be the fruit of our pains.

To the 4th proposition, we will briefly say, that the hardihood which could ascribe so base and criminal a motive to Dr. Fothergill ! Granville Sharp ! Wilberforce ! and Clarkson ! as *prejudice against the blacks*, in their humane efforts in behalf of the colony at Sierra Leone ; and impeach with a similar *prejudice* the great and good men, who living and dying have regarded the colonization of our coloured population as "*desirable*," merits only our pity and contempt. Here then we are taught, that our distinguished fellow citizens, Lafayette, Monroe, Madison, Marshall, Jefferson, bishops White and Meade, Carroll of Carrollton, Bushrod Washington, Henry Clay, Webster, Mercer, Frelinghuysen, and a host of others, statesmen, patriots, philosophers, Christians, and divines, because they consider the colonization of our coloured population "*desirable*," must be therefore branded with being influenced by "*nothing but a prejudice against the blacks*." If the authors of this proposition, were susceptible of shame, they would blush at the infamy which it merits. But the 5th proposition declares that "*this prejudice is conquerable by the moral power of the gospel*." And what is this but a declaration that until the year 1832, the "*gospel*" either had no "*moral power*," or failed to exert it ; for until that period it is affirmed, as we have seen, that this "*prejudice*" was "*an oppressive spell upon the humanity of the whole nation !*" If, indeed, we have been until now a nation of heathens, destitute of the "*moral power of the gospel*," which is equivalent to a destitution of the gospel itself, these apostles who now hold this "*moral power*" will be responsible if we be not universally converted and conquered. How strange does it appear to the unsophisticated reader of the New Testament, to learn from the Holy Evangelists, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Divine Author of the "*gospel*," and the great source of all its "*moral power*," never once uttered a single sentence against slave holding, that "*heinous crime*," which is "*worse than piracy and murder !*" And although at the time of our Lord's personal ministry, as well as during the period of the labours of His Apostles, in founding Christianity, and introducing the "*moral power of the gospel*" into our world ; a *system of slavery* existed under the Roman government, which in point of severity far exceeded that of the United States ; yet He and they, in no one instance, bore a testimony against this "*heinous crime in the sight of God !*" Is it not passing strange that our Lord did not abrogate that part of the *Moral Law*, which as much forbids the coveting of a *man servant* or *maid servant*, as the

coveting of any other species of property. Why did he not except this, when he said "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil." This proposition most absurdly and impiously charges the Son of God either with ignorance of the "moral power" of his own "gospel," or with a most unaccountable omission to explain or enforce it. See also Luke xvii. 7, 8, for a distinct recognition of slavery as it existed at the time under the laws of the country, when the Saviour acted as he uniformly did, and as he taught his disciples to do, "Render unto Cæsar, the things that are Cæsar's."

But St. Paul must have been altogether unacquainted with the "moral power of the gospel," for he says, "Art thou called being a servant, care not for it, but if thou *mayest be made free*, use it rather." "He that is called in the Lord being a servant, is the Lord's freeman." "Servants, be subject to your masters, with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." So also in all those places in which the Apostles enjoin obedience upon *servants*, and enforce the relative obligations upon *masters*, the doctrines of this whole Report would imply that the Apostles themselves were ignorant of the "gospel," or failed to employ its "moral power." Indeed the Report tells us in view of these five propositions we have thus briefly noticed, that "Just so fast as the full and overwhelming evidence of these propositions is brought fairly before the candid and virtuous, they forsake the colonization cause, and enter the ranks of the abolitionists!"

If their ranks be increased only "just so fast" as *any* "evidence of these propositions" is furnished to "the candid and virtuous," we need no longer marvel at the paucity of their numbers, which compared with any other popular delusion, is indeed singularly inconsiderable; for there *can be no evidence*, except that which shows their folly, absurdity, and untruth. If the numbers who have *fully* enrolled themselves under the banners of the Anti-slavery Society, and "*go the whole*" with them, in their measures, could be accurately ascertained: we apprehend that the Mormonites of the west would be found to outnumber them, notwithstanding the pomp and circumstance with which the former has been urged upon the public mind, and the deceptive charm which attaches to their imposing *name*, with the republican feelings of America, where "Liberty" is regarded as a *household Deity*.

We are next told, that "most men become colonizationists *they know not why*," whereas "none become abolitionists but by a searching investigation of facts, not without an entire change of thought and feeling, a revolution of the soul," &c. We recollect

a memorable instance of conversion in the person of a leading "abolitionist," in whose case it cannot be pretended that there was any "searching investigation of facts," for he himself attributes it to a *discovery made in England*, that the *free coloured* people in America, were nearly unanimous in their opposition to *Colonization!* The latter part of the description we believe to be strictly correct, for so entire is the "change of thought and feeling," and the "revolution of the soul," that some of them seem bereft of their reason. But the Report adds, that "the zeal and energy of this collected band, when *kindled* up through the country, will *sweep away* the *bulwarks of slavery!*" But hold, gentlemen, these "bulwarks of slavery" which you threaten to "sweep away," by the "*kindling*" up of the fires of your wrath, are none other than the "Constitution of the United States," and the "laws of the land;" for slavery has no other "bulwarks." You did not know that you would so soon be driven to a public *disclaimer* of any disposition to "interfere with the constitution or laws of the country," when you published this report, or you would have suppressed it, if you meant, that any disclaimer should gain the public credence. In truth, we regard this paragraph alone, on the 49th page of your pamphlet, as distinctly avowing a purpose to "sweep away" the "bulwarks of slavery," regardless of consequences, and hence, we conceive that the "zeal and energy" of this "collected band," thus openly arrayed against the laws, is no less treasonable, because of its impotence, and ought therefore to be detected, exposed, and defeated in its incipient progress, lest the impunity extended to such an avowal may embolden its authors to some overt act of outrage and treason.

It is not a little remarkable, that the authors of this Report, are so bewildered in contemplating the wonderful achievements of their Society, that they attribute all the sympathy for the slave, which they hear of as existing in the South, to the "powerful array" which they have erected, and even the laws of Kentucky and Tennessee, in favour of the gradual abolition of slavery, are attributed to "our publications," and "our doctrines," when these laws were originated, if not passed, before the existence of their Society, and while they say there was "scarcely a rill of pity for the slave." Still, however, they call the humane provisions of those states, that all born hereafter shall be free at twenty-five years of age, but "*a wretched mockery of justice!*"

But the Report next refers to the "act of emancipation," recently passed in Great Britain, by which colonial slavery is gradually abolished, with compensation to the masters. And here again "*gradual* emancipation" is claimed as the result of

"the doctrine of *immediate* emancipation urged upon the conscience of the British people !"

This reference to Great Britain is a most unfortunate illustration, from the fact, that the gradual system of emancipation adopted with reference to colonial slavery, has been the result of forty years' arduous and unceasing labour, by very many of the most distinguished philanthropists who ever lived in any country. And besides, their act of emancipation in itself admits to the full extent, the "*right of property in man*," claimed by the slave owners, and therefore provides for compensation ; a feature this, which the Anti-Slavery Society would be slow to consent to, especially incumbered by the *gradualism* of its character.

But the reference is still more unfortunate, coupled as it is with an allusion to "two advocates of the British slaves, Charles Stuart, and George Thompson, who are expected soon to arrive on our shores, to devote their noble energies to the same cause." The former, called in the Report "*a beloved coadjutor*," has arrived, and is now an itinerant agent, enlightening the Americans on the subject of the laws and institutions of their own country ! The Report may talk of "*the narrow prejudice of clan*, dignified by the name of national pride," but Americans will never be indifferent to the dangers of "*foreign influence*." The language of the Father of his country can never be forgotten or unheeded, when he said "Against the *insidious wiles of foreign influence*, (*I conjure you* to believe me, fellow citizens,) the *jealousy* of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake, since history and experience prove that *foreign influence* is one of *the most baneful foes of republican government* !" Such was the language of the great and good Washington, and can never be repeated too often to his countrymen. And there never was a time when foreign influence should be more deprecated, nor was there ever a subject, an interference with which, by the agents of a foreign government, should be more diligently guarded, than the present. No pretensions to philanthropy, however exclusive, and even disinterested in such agents, can be safely tolerated in this country, lest foreign zealots by thousands may be imported for the ostensible purpose of promoting the abolition of slavery, who may be instrumental in promoting less worthy objects. Let our countrymen take warning then, by this early movement of the Anti-slavery party, lest they repent their indifference at their leisure when it will be unavailing.\*

\* We perceive by the papers, that a foreigner, who professes to be a minister of the gospel, has been lately figuring at the East, and has received a gentle rebuke from a portion of the public press, for his assault upon the institutions of the country, and his violent declamation in favour of "*immediate abolition*,"



But to proceed with the Report, we next find a pathetic description of the hapless condition of the slaves, which though strongly tinged with the extravagance of the party, is nevertheless prompted by humanity, and in the main may be true. But the highly wrought narratives of several instances of fugitive slaves, who have been arrested in this city and elsewhere, and according to the laws of the land restored to their owners, in which these masters and their agents are called "*legalized kidnappers*," is, to say the least, of doubtful expediency and of questionable tendency too. That such publications are calculated to excite resistance to the laws will not be questioned, whether designed for this purpose or not. For an example, we refer to the *following paragraph*, which follows the narratives referred to, and we appeal to the understanding and conscience of the reader, whether such a publication is not "*incendiary*" in its character, and whether such sentiments and language be not Anti-American and Anti-Christian. That they are illogical and absurd, is of less importance than their abstract wickedness.

"These persecuted people, when apprehended as fugitives, quietly submit to *the iniquitous law*, and seldom is any violent effort made by their friends for their *rescue*; but, say the masters, if they were emancipated, they would rise and cut the throats of their benefactors! It is time the friends of freedom had awaked from their *disgraceful* slumbers. The truth is, and it must be suppressed no longer, we have been *hired* to abet oppression—to be the tools of tyrants—to look on coolly while 2,000,000 of our brethren have been stripped of every right, and *worse than murdered*! Solemnly we say, and we stake all on the pledge, that there is not wealth enough in the universe any longer to buy *our acquiescence in this base and abominable subserviency*. Common sense teaches us, that it is no less a crime to op-

in a state and among a people where slavery was abolished long before he left his own land. It is worthy of remark that the records of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, will show that this same foreign incendiary, but a few years ago, received the highest ecclesiastical censure of that body, for *cruelty and inhumanity to his own servants*, in one of our slave states. He is not now a member of that body, and yet he is peregrinating through the North and East, declaiming against the cruelties of slave holding, which he knows by *experience*, and in conjunction with another foreign emissary, instructing the ignorant Americans in the laws and institutions of their own country! Patriotism and Christianity should alike forbid our citizens to listen to such officious intermeddling in our country's affairs by these imported demagogues.

press an already injured man, than to seize a fresh victim ; that what is crime in Africa, is no less so in the United States ; that if the foreign slave-trade has been justly declared piracy, it was always piracy ; consequently the man who seizes another in New-York, and drags him away into bondage, *whatever laws he may have in his favour*, is to be regarded as a *robber and pirate* ! We *do not understand* the constitution of the United States to justify such a criminal at all. *If we did*, we would *never cease* to labour to wipe off so foul and deadly a stain from that noble instrument ; for we remember an older and nobler constitution, which says—"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee : he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best ; thou shalt not oppress him."—*Deut.* xxiii. 15, 16.

If this be not unsophisticated nullification, we have yet to learn an instance in the history of our country. We invite a reference to the several expressions which are italicized, and pass on without any farther comment.

For the special benefit of all who are imposed upon by this reference to the Bible, and for the purpose of showing the want of candor and consistency exhibited by the quotation made from Deuteronomy, we will however, *en passant*, refer to Leviticus xxv. 44, 45, 46, which in justice to "the older and nobler constitution" ought to accompany the scriptural citation here made.

"Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are around about you, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers, that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession ; they shall be your bondmen forever ; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule over one another with rigour."

We introduce this quotation because it is equally applicable with that in the Report, though neither of them can legitimately be claimed as having the least bearing on American slavery. It may serve to show, however, that even Satan can quote scripture, and often does it, "when he lieth in wait to deceive."

The *appeal for funds* with which the Report concludes in a

strain of rhapsody and poetry, though somewhat ludicrous, would be less objectionable if the society had informed the public precisely what they propose to do with the 20,000 dollars which they modestly ask for the present year. How many trophies of immediate abolition will that sum procure? If we may estimate the character of their future expenditure of funds by the past, we must conclude that anti-slavery though they be, this whole amount is to be disbursed for printing newspapers, handbills, and reports like the present, and in employing editors and agents, British and American, to travel through the northern states, where there are no slaves, and denounce their fellow-citizens of the south as robbers and pirates! not forgetting to declaim against the Constitution of the land, as "*a compact fit only for devils to make!*" and the Colonization Society as "*originated in hell!*" All this while the poor slaves are forgotten, and the public money given to promote abolition is to be squandered in arraying the north against the south, increasing the miseries and privations of the slaves, augmenting the prejudice against colour, which they so loudly deprecate, and exciting popular tumult, commotion, and alarm.

Meanwhile, if the 20,000 dollars they propose to expend the present year, in this crusade against "vincible prejudice," without producing a single instance of immediate abolition or anti-slavery practice, were paid into the funds of the American Colonization Society, one thousand emancipated slaves might be placed in freedom upon the land of their fathers, who else may be doomed with their posterity to hopeless and interminable bondage. Which of these institutions then deserves the epithet of "dehusion," and which of them is truly "anti-slavery" in practice, judge ye! And let the true friends of emancipation pause, before they consent to contribute to the treasury of a society, which, though professing to be anti-slavery in theory, expends all its energies and its funds in idle declamation, or the support of an incendiary press, without one single example of "immediate abolition," without breaking the fetters of a single slave!

Such are the strictures which a sense of duty has called forth upon this 1st Report published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and it now remains briefly to remark on the *speeches delivered at the late Anniversary* meeting, as officially issued by the Executive Committee, in connexion with the Report, and by which act the Society assumes the responsibility of the sentiments and doctrines they inculcate.

The first of these speeches is that of Rev. Amos A. Phelps, late of Boston, now the permanent agent of this Society. He

introduced a resolution declaring slave-holding to be *piracy*, equally atrocious with slave-trading. Though he admits this to be "very high ground," yet he attempted to sustain it, by affirming that what "constitutes slave-holding the crime of piracy, is the simple act of reducing a *freeman* to the condition of a *slave*,—wresting from a *human being* the ownership of himself." This is a most singular definition of piracy, and in its application to the slaves of the United States is singularly inapplicable. When was any one of these slaves a *freeman*? Or when did he possess the ownership of himself? If his definition be admitted in its full extent, it would be impossible to show that this act of *piracy* was ever committed in this country. Certainly no man is now a slave who ever was a freeman; and there are but few whose *parents were not slaves*, perhaps for several generations. And certainly there lives not the man in the southern states who was ever guilty of "reducing a *freeman* to the condition of a *slave*, or ever wrested from a human being the ownership of himself," and as this is alleged as constituting piracy, no slave-holder has been guilty of this crime according to Mr. P.'s own showing. They never were "freemen," nor did they ever possess the "ownership of themselves," and if the crime he describes were ever committed, by the ancestors of the present race of slave-holders, these criminals have long since gone to the judgment of Him who will do no wrong. And this "proverb is no longer known in Israel, the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." Mr. P. reminds us of the "fable of the wolf and the lamb," which furnishes an apt illustration of the spirit and scope of his heinous charge against thousands of his fellow-citizens, who have given evidence of Christian character and spotless integrity, which all his denunciations and anathemas will fail to tarnish.

But this reverend agent would find it no easy task to show that the slaves of this country were ever *freemen*, even in their ancestry, to however remote a period he might trace the genealogy of any individual among them. Can he designate an individual slave, who is descended from a *freeman*, even in Africa? Can he furnish the pedigree of any number of them, whose forefathers when removed from their own country were not either prisoners of war, or who had not otherwise forfeited their lives by the laws of their own country? Or is he ignorant of the palpable and cruel bondage of the tribes of Africa to their petty kings, who hold unlimited power over the liberty and even the lives of their subjects?

It is true, that after Mr. P.'s precise definition of piracy before mentioned, he adds, "*it is this, divested of all its circumstances!*"

Indeed ! Then the civil authorities of our country, when they "reduce a freeman to the condition of a slave," by sending him to the state prison, and "wrest from a human being the ownership of himself," by committing him to the penitentiary, or sentencing him to the gallows ; in all these cases, both judges and juries are guilty of *piracy*, for "it is this divested of all its circumstances." And even in those states where the laws admit of imprisonment for debt, every such instance is an act of *piracy* on the part of all concerned. The truth is, the proposition, and the logic by which it is sustained, are alike contemptible ; and the friends of the society should place their "permanent agency" in better hands.

But Mr. P. is not content with the affirmation that *slave-holding* is piracy equally with *slave-trading*, but he adds "If there is any difference in criminality, *slave-holding* is the worst of the two !" so that all who are implicated in the latter, "divested of all circumstances," are *worse than pirates*, and this is almost a parallel to the language of the Report, which affirms that the slaves are "*worse than murdered* !" Both piracy and murder are capital offences in our country, and we know not what penalty this Rev. gentleman would inflict upon criminals *worse than both*, unless he meditates another Southampton massacre, and means to show that even this is merited, by all who are guilty of slave-holding, which is a crime worse than piracy and murder ! We pity the infatuation of the man who could make such a speech, and still more the weakness and malignity of those who could listen to it without indignation.

But we forbear to pursue any farther the folly and extravagance of this newly-fledged agent, for the whole speech is a tissue of similar rant, hyperbole, and fiction, and is characterized by an excess of bitterness which carries with it its own refutation. We will only add, that he accuses the civil authorities of the city of New York with the crime of *piracy*, in restoring fugitive slaves to their owners by legal process, according to the provisions of the Constitution and the statutes of the state, which they are sworn to support ; for he declares it to be "*legalized violence* as we see done in New York, but still overpowering force, *as much as in Africa*." No other "legalized violence" is ever seen in New York than that we have named, and yet he pronounces this to be *piracy*, as much as the violence used by the slave-trader or kidnapper in obtaining victims in Africa. Such are the sentiments adopted and published as their own, by the American Anti-Slavery Society ; and our citizens may thus understand what they may expect to hear from this permanent agent, wherever they consent to listen to his itinerant declamation.

The next speech is that of Mr. Thome, of Kentucky, a student of the Lane Seminary, who, but that he is a boy, and may some time or other be a man, and repent of his folly and calumny too, we might be led to visit his windy eloquence with the rebuke it merits. Even his youthful indiscretion and puerility itself, however it may plead extenuation in his behalf, cannot nevertheless excuse exaggeration and falsehood. Much less can the Society find justification, for endorsing the calumnies, which his fiery zeal in their cause led him to utter. If they were his friends, they owed it to this unfortunate and misguided youth, to suppress this his maiden speech, and suffer its vulgarity and obscenity to be speedily forgotten by the motley assemblage of blacks and whites, who were so shocked by its delivery. But by assuming this tirade of hyperbole as their own, the Society must bear the reproach it merits, and the scorn which every American feels at its false and disgusting details.

The principal portion of this protracted address is upon the *licentiousness* of slavery, in all the loathsome details of which this young orator was perfectly "at home." And accordingly, he affirmed upon his own personal "knowledge," that "the slave states are Sodoms, and almost every village family a brothel!" and he added, "*It is well! God be blessed for the evils which this sin entails!*" The following specimen of the universal licentiousness which he described as existing in the slave states, will show the hardihood and audacity of this juvenile, but experienced observer:—

"*Pollution, pollution! Young men of talents and respectability, fathers, professors of religion, ministers—ALL CLASSES! Overwhelming pollution!*" and he adds, "I would not have you fail to understand that this is a *general evil!*" Such an outrage upon truth and upon decency, as is this infamous libel upon "all classes" in the slave states, has earned for its author, and those who now publicly assume the responsibility of the wholesale slander, a perpetuity of infamy; and ought to subject them to the moral frown of the whole American community.

The details uttered by this calumniator, are too polluting to bear repetition. Indeed, this brazen young man, who seemed to glory in his own shame, after talking of "unblushing profligacy," "moral contamination," "indiscriminate debauchery," "courtisan feats," "overwhelming pollution," &c., in the second edition of his speech, also printed in this pamphlet, gives evidence that even *he* seemed to have a moment's struggle with conscience, while he exclaimed,

"*I know* an instance in the village where I live, that things were transacted which *I cannot name before this assembly*, in

the kitchen of a respectable family, and *not an individual of the family knew of it.*" Indeed, he vindicated his fellow-citizens of Kentucky, by assuring the audience, that even they "*did not know it.*" But *he* knew it from "personal knowledge!" What an experienced young man is this! And if thus early in life, he knows the *pollution* in families, villages, and states, which *no one else* knew but himself, and knew it all by personal experience too, who can contradict him? The audience who listened to the disgusting exhibition of himself, which this Mr. T. presented, must have been vastly edified by the picture he drew of those scenes, in which it seems he bore so conspicuous a part. It was enough "to make one hide his head, and blush to own himself a man."

But waving the shocking obtuseness of moral sense in one so young, and the indelicacy and indiscretion of such an exhibition, all who know any thing of the southern or western character, must be horrified at the recklessness of the outrage, which is here perpetrated upon "all classes" of the slave states, and the utter disregard of truth which characterizes the whole address. If this young man had any character to lose, it is forfeited for ever; and having refused to retract, though called upon to do so, the false and offensive statements of his first speech, and repeated them in his second; he must endure the brand of a *calumniator*, which the Rev. John Breckenbridge, another Kentuckian, has *burned into his forehead.* The Society in whose behalf he thus prostrated himself beyond recovery, have made that brand indelible, though they divide with him the unenviable shame of its turpitude, by publishing his speeches in the pamphlet before us.

With the speech of the Rev. Beriah Green, which is next inserted, as it contains nothing but the stereotyped malignity and treason for which he has been so often and so justly rebuked, and which he has repeated so frequently, that it has almost ceased to be regarded, except as the ravings of a madman, it will not be necessary to be very critical. As usual, "prejudice," and the "*cords of caste,*" are the chief subjects of his railing, and he complains sadly of "those *PENS* into which we thrust the coloured people who choose to visit our houses of worship;" for he thinks that according to the doctrines of the Report, there should be "no distinction of colour." Indeed he alleges, before we send the Gospel to the heathen abroad, we must show that Christianity makes an American believer receive his coloured "brother as his own mother's son," and of course a *coloured sister, as his own mother's daughter,*—but there is no amalgamation here! no intermarriages are intended! Oh no!!

The Rev. Mr. Ludlow has just cause of complaint against the society for refusing to endorse his speech in all its length and breadth, though it was a very short one. He is here reported as having barely remarked that "this meeting was the funeral of colonization," whereas it is said by those who were present, that he "rang the funeral knell, sang the funeral dirge, stood upon the grave," and invited the congregation to raise a *Te Deum*, for, said he, "we are now attending the funeral of the American Colonization Society." It is said that it was among the most splendid efforts of his eloquence, and we must censure the society for suppressing it.

The Rev. Dr. Cox, who followed, seemed to be overpowered by the "agonizing interest" of the funeral service, by his predecessor, and therefore said but little, reserving his strength for the adjourned meeting, and both speeches are here reported, the latter at length. In the first he said nothing worthy of remark, except that "he was prepared to maintain the ground, that it was a duty instantly to recognise the coloured man, as the Lord Jesus Christ recognised him." What kind of *coloured man* he referred to, he did not explain, and as he has since publicly maintained in the pulpit, and vindicated through the press, the sentiment that "*Jesus Christ was himself a coloured man*," meaning as he explains it, an Asiatic, brown, or olive colour, we cannot hope to do him justice without an explanation of *terms*, as *he uses them*.

The meeting was adjourned after a few words from William Lloyd Garrison, of the *Liberator*, and his imported coadjutor, Charles Stuart, neither of whom, nor what they said, deserve a single remark. Both of them are dipped in kindred gall, and neither can ever be sweetened; and as they have not originated or received a new idea for years, and are incapable of any other spirit than that of anti-colonizationists, we shall leave them, and pass on to notice a few of the speakers who occupied the adjourned meeting.

The Rev. S. S. Jocelyn commenced the adjourned meeting by advocating a resolution, charging "the American church with the *blood of souls*, with *holding the keys* of the great prison of oppression, with being *herself enslaved*," and such like rant and extravagance. It is a pity that so good a man as is Mr. J. should be found in such employment, and in such company. Were it not for his "bad advisers," he would never have introduced such a resolution, much less advocated it. Who made him a judge over "the American church?" And how does he consent to call men "evangelical christians," who hold 300,000 slaves, according to his own showing? And still worse, he charges these "evangelical christians with inflicting a system of cruelty and oppres-



sion," and declares that their slaves are "uncultured in their minds—uninformed in their morals—and *unprotected by the laws.*" Mr. J. has heard these stories and told them so often, that he absolutely believes them himself! It would be idle to attempt a refutation of the fiction and poetry such as this, by which even good men are deceiving others, while themselves are deceived. We pass on to the address of Rev. Samuel J. May, on the "duty of the christians of the north, by christian means, to do all they can to procure immediate abolition." And here we remark, there are the most alarming and treasonable sentiments advanced and enforced by this minister of the gospel, which we recollect to have seen or read in the whole history of our country. A few examples will suffice to consign the author of this speech, and all who sanction it, to the just reprobation of every patriot and of every American christian, for this foul assault against our common country.

After telling us in a strain of prophetic exultation, about "the *bloody tragedy* that must one day wind up this stupendous drama;" and impiously declaring that in event of a "*servile war,*" the spirit we should then have to extinguish, would be "what, in our revolutionary fathers we call *the noble spirit of liberty!*" he proceeds to speak with equal combustibility of the constitution of the United States in the following language :

"Suppose the *constitution* did sanction slavery? What then? While there is a God in heaven, who regards mercy and equity, *can we be bound* by any *compacts of our own*, or any *enactments of our fellow worms*, to sin against Him?" And again,

"I am every day grieved to hear so much said of *the value of our union*, and so little of the value of the approbation of God, as though his favour would be purchased too dear if it involved the *interruption* of a PARTNERSHIP IN SIN!"

Here then we have an *American* and a *clergyman* too, at the anniversary of an *American* society, denominating our "Union," a *partnership in sin*, and talking of its "interruption" as necessary to the "approbation of God." If such be his estimate of our civil compact, it is no marvel that he is "every day grieved at hearing so much said of the value of our Union!" Nor need we wonder that he turns aside from his high vocation to vilify his country. Let the following foul slander of our institutions suffice to hold up this calumniator and traitor to the indignation of his country.

"By the laws of our country, the slave is placed beyond the *protection* of law!"

This sentence is a falsehood of so deep a dye, that it is incredible how any man who has a character to lose, would hazard that character by uttering, much less publishing it. And yet as it is

a stereotyped calumny of the party, and one of the "*christian* means" to procure "immediate abolition," it may be proper to remark in this place, that "the laws of the slave states provide for the *protection of life*," since the murder of a slave is punished with death; to kill a slave is as much murder in contemplation of law, and enlightened public opinion, as to kill a freeman, and punishment is the same in both cases. The master who kills his slave is as obnoxious to the penalty of the law as any other person, and in fact more so. He is presumed to be guilty of the murder, if he reside on the plantation when one of his slaves is killed, until he can show the contrary by proof, or will purge himself by oath. And yet a professed christian minister insults heaven and earth, by affirming that "by the *laws of our country*, the slave is placed *beyond the protection of law!*" If this man belonged to any evangelical denomination of orthodox christians, he would be deposed from the sacred office, unless he could show that he was "invincibly ignorant."

The laws also provide that when charged with capital crimes, or minor offences, the slaves are entitled to a *fair trial*, and in the master's presence, that he may shield the innocent, and see that none are unlawfully condemned. The laws also restrain all unnecessary *rigour in punishment*, prohibit the labour of slaves being *more than 14 hours* in the 24, and the laws compel the master to furnish *reasonable food and clothing* to his slaves.

The laws of the southern states also provide that slaves may attend at *whatever church they choose*, and secures to them all, the *right of the Sabbath*. For the protection of their morals, the law also removes the incentives to theft, by prohibiting *trading* with the slaves, without the written permission of the master; and protection against intemperance is also furnished, by the laws against *selling or giving intoxicating liquors* to slaves, without their master's consent.

And yet Mr. Jocelyn says they are unprotected by the laws! and Mr. M. tells us that by *law* they are placed beyond the *protection of the law*, and the Report as well as speeches, are ever and anon repeating their lamentation over this stupid calumny. But we forbear.

The next speaker, Rev. S. L. Pomeroy, in a highly inflammatory harangue, ranks the "slave holder, and the slave apologist," with "*the murderer, the pirate, the midnight assassin, the libertine, the traitor*," and such like characters. And he glories in the fact of "the disturbance at the South," as owing to "our efforts, and our doctrines, our reproofs, our warnings," and says, "we are preaching anti-slavery at the South." We suppose the "disturbances at the South," of which he boasts as one

of the fruits of Anti-slavery "preaching," are such as the insurrection and massacre of Southampton, for in proof that a salutary impression is made there, he says "Mr. Chairman, thousands of our fellow citizens of the south, will go to bed to-night with their *loaded pistols* under their pillows, and their *muskets* over the mantel piece!"

And is this a source of exultation? Can it be such, to any but a fiend, to have the consciousness of having contributed in the least to such a state of things? How true that there are some men "whose glorying is in their shame!"

He concludes his speech by a pathetic description of the hapless condition of the slaves, which so far as it is true is unexceptionable. But as a specimen of the outrageous recklessness of truth, by which this minister is signalized, and it is only one of many, we quote from his account of the treatment of the slaves.

"They have no *privileges* except what their masters *please*, to give them!" Is the Sabbath no privilege? Is going to any church they please, no privilege? These they have secured by law, whether the master *please* or not, and Mr. P. knows it, for he says he has lived at the south. Again, "whatever is done to them, they have no redress." This is palpably false, as may be seen by a reference to the laws for their protection to which we have alluded; and yet he adds, "The master can do what he pleases with his slaves, and they cannot *help themselves*." Suppose, for example, that the master *pleases* to neglect feeding and clothing his slaves, cannot they "*help themselves*?" Suppose he *pleases* to make them work longer than the law allows, or to employ them on the Sabbath, or to require them to attend a particular church contrary to their inclination, can they not "*help themselves*?" No man knows better than this Mr. P., that bad as slavery is, he has basely slandered the system and the laws of his country by which it is sustained. Such misrepresentations and exaggerations must originate in such a case from the unhal-  
lowed sentiment, that "*the end sanctifies the means*."

Mr. H. B. Stanton, of Lane Seminary, seems to exhaust all his eloquence in assailing the Colonization Society, by which he "means, all those who cherish expatriating sentiments in respect to the coloured people." He says, "the prejudice against the coloured people is *vincible*," while he alleges that the Colonization Society is founded on the doctrine that "prejudice is *invincible*." And yet he affirms that there is a "cruel public sentiment" and a "cruel prejudice" against the people of colour, in New York, in Maryland, and all "*through the land*," and that this is identical with the desire for their expatriation. He represents this Colonization Society as "*wielding the public sentiment*," and at the same

time "borne along by it," and declares that not merely the clergy and the statesmen, the literati and the colleges, the press and the learned professions, the ecclesiastical authorities and the eighteen legislatures, are "at the bidding" of the Colonization Society; but that this "IS THE PUBLIC SENTIMENT OF THE NATION, and may do what it pleases," and yet with such a description of the universality of cruel "prejudice," and "cruel public sentiment" as is here given by himself, he prates about "*prejudice vincible!*" If the half of this vilification of our country were true, none but a madman could hope to be listened to, in his pretences to show that this "prejudice is vincible!" Indeed he sapiently exclaims, "Remove this prejudice, and the Colonization Society is dissolved instantaneously!" Prodigious discovery! It resembles that unlucky illustration of the Rev. Mr. Ludlow, in his suppressed speech, when he said that if all the negroes in the land could be miraculously converted into whites, in a single night, the Colonization Society would be dissolved! and thus he said he could "prove that the *prejudice* was only *skin deep!*" We marvel that this speech of Mr. S. were not suppressed from this pamphlet, with Mr. L.'s funeral oration already alluded to, for it equals the latter in the attribute of stupidity, and deserved a kindred fate. The speech however was sustained in all its dark characteristics by a black man, who seconded it, and he falsely charged the Colonization Society with "*producing enactments against coloured schools, and sustaining legislative provisions for thrusting the coloured people out of their native land.*" If the Society were willing to hear this calumny, whose author's heart must be as black as his skin; the "intelligent free coloured people" should not allow him to obtrude himself as their representative any where. There is however about as much truth in this, as in the rest of the didactic and dogmatical averments of the whole pamphlet. And perhaps this poor coloured man is not so much to blame as those who told him what to say. In this case, he was in the same predicament with a certain Thomas C. Brown, who flourished at a late farce gotten up by the Anti-slavery men, and who having learned his lesson by rote, gave in his "testimony" *secundum artem*. When will the coloured people learn who are their true friends?

Having noticed already the supplement of Mr. Thome's speech, and "the kind and Christian spirit" it evinces according to the testimony of the Report, we will now briefly allude to the address of the Rev. Dr. Cox, which terminated this first Anniversary. The first thing he proposed to do, was to "emancipate the *whites* from *prejudice!*" And here he says,

"I shall be met with the standing objection about amalga-

tion. Will you encourage *intermarriages* between blacks and whites?" What an opportunity here afforded itself for the Rev. Dr. clearly and explicitly to disavow the sentiment, and enter a public disclaimer if he did not hold it. But does he do any such thing? Where is his boasted candour and his "independent set of principles" now? Reader! are you not prepared to hear him say, "we utterly repudiate the sentiment, and purge ourselves of its enormity." Would you not look for a clear and distinct declaration, that the amalgamation of the races by intermarriage was neither desired nor desirable, now that he had himself introduced the odious subject, in connexion with his stale rant about prejudice? But what does he say? Hark! "*for my part, I cannot see that it has any thing to do with the question!*" And after an illustration most disjointedly introduced about enfranchizing the Jews, when there can be no analogy in the cases, yet reasoning as though they were parallel, he asks, "Would not a single grain of common sense teach, that with the question of franchisement, the question of *intermarriage* has *nothing* at all to do. Let us do our duty, sir, and enfranchise our *coloured people* according to their *equal* rights. And THEN! if they rise in virtue and goodness, so as to *command* and *deserve* our respect, LET THEM HAVE IT!!" It will probably be said that with the question of *intermarriage* this last sentence also has "*nothing to do,*" but the reader who perceives its direct connexion will form his own conclusion. We think it manifests clearly that the Rev. Dr. has suffered a relapse of his old morbid theory, in renouncing which, he became a colonizationist, and which, it is said, he used to call his "*favourite plan* for elevating the people of colour, at the *Hymeneal altar!*"\* The greater obscurity of his expressions now, may be necessary on the ground of *expediency*.

The rest of Dr. C.'s speech is made up of his usual assault upon the Colonization Society, its impracticability and wickedness, without argument, or even the semblance of any thing but arrogant declamation; together with the egotism by which he is so characterized in his intellectual and moral nature, that he is in this respect without parallel, and we fear beyond remedy. As,

\* This famous speech of Dr. Cox, cost a friend of ours six dollars, and as he says, was "paying for a dead horse." He had employed a reporter to attend the Colonization meeting at which this Reverend Doctor was to display his eloquence, and when the speech was taken down by the stenographer, and transcribed for the press, the grossness of the amalgamation doctrines it contained, although repudiated for the views of the Colonization Society, nevertheless, rendered it unfit for the public eye, and in mercy to him as well as to the society, the speech was suppressed. Perhaps a new edition of it may be expected, now that the author has resumed his favourite plan, or at least as soon as it is *expedient*.

however, in his past history, such a morbid paroxysm as that under which he now appears to labour, has, on some other subjects, had its termination; we trust that in a lucid interval, on this subject, he may yet become again both useful and happy, for we doubt whether for some months past he has been either; certainly not to the extent that he otherwise would be. We shall, therefore, close our notice of this pamphlet without any farther reference to this misguided and erring brother, since he already occupies so unenviable a position before the public eye, as almost to disarm criticism. We wish him a safe and speedy deliverance from his "bad eminence."

Having thus briefly noticed the Report and published speeches of this pamphlet, it may here be in place to refer to the character of this Anniversary meeting, in one particular which distinguished it pre-eminently above every other held or known in this country, and we shall also briefly allude to some subsequent events.

Let it be remembered, that it was held during the "Anniversary week," as it is called, in this city, a religious festival, annually held in May. The American Bible Society, and other great religious institutions, celebrate their Anniversaries on the successive days of the week, and many hundreds of clerical and lay delegates from various parts of the country, are in attendance. For the present year, these several Societies had selected the Chatham-street Chapel, for their respective celebrations; and in the arrangements for the occupancy of the building on the different days of the week, this American Anti-Slavery Society had secured the house for Tuesday morning, which gave it a prominence among the events of the week, to which relatively and by priority, it was hardly entitled. Still, however, although some were disposed to be dissatisfied, none could justly complain of any violation of right, and the public, including those who were opposed to the Society and its relative position, entirely acquiesced.

When, however, the house began to fill up, and it was observed that very many coloured people, forsaking the separate place assigned to them in the house on all other occasions, began to seat themselves promiscuously through the Chapel, some surprise was felt and expressed, which was increased on its being announced from the pulpit, that the congregation would be seated *without distinction of colour*; and a similar promiscuous invitation given to the seats on the platform, which was readily accepted by the coloured people; and the choir who were to perform the music of the occasion, were partly blacks and partly whites. These arrangements, obviously preconcerted, being entirely new in this region, produced some revulsion of feeling at the time;

nevertheless, the whole meeting proceeded to its termination without any serious interruption, and also the adjournment held at Dr. Lansing's church, although a similar mixture of colours was exhibited there, but to a less extent. This distinctive feature of the meeting, as it was not at all necessary for the objects of the Society, we regretted at the time, regarding it as indiscreet, believing, as we did, that though the time may come, when such a course would be safe and judicious on such occasions, that time has not yet arrived. We thought it imprudent in so young a society, and broaching doctrines confessedly novel, thus to invite public odium, and hazard the success of their cause. Still however it was lawful, though it might be inexpedient; for no one was obliged to go there, or to remain, if dissatisfied with the arrangements the Society chose to adopt for their own meeting. Hence we regarded any violent expression of disapprobation, as no ordinary outrage upon the rights of the Society, and the hitherto sacredness of the place, and one which ought not to be permitted or countenanced by any. None however was attempted, although hisses were occasionally heard when some of the most offensive sentiments we have named were uttered; but such interruptions occur in other public meetings, and though incapable of justification, yet they are generally connived at.

That this preconcerted admixture of the audience, affording a practical illustration of the equality "irrespective of complexion" which the Society contemplates, has been productive in subsequent meetings of scenes of disorder and even riot, can not admit of a doubt. Indeed, it is more than probable, that but for this attempt, in the language of one of the Anti-Slavery bulletins, "to ACT OUT the sentiment, that God made of ONE BLOOD all the families of the earth," the public tumult and disgraceful riots, which we all deplore, had never been engendered. And although we scarcely know how to express the mortification and indignation too, which these outrages upon personal, and even church property, have every where justly excited; yet we believe they had never occurred, but for *this single cause!*

"The cruel prejudice of caste," as it is called, existing, as it does, in the *lowest classes* of our white population, to a *greater extent* than any where else; might naturally be expected to operate upon the ignorant and depraved, by exciting the worst passions, and prompting to deeds of violence such as those we have been compelled to witness in this city, and which required the strong arm of civil and military force to subdue. Such a result was feared by many, from the mixture at the Anniversary meeting; and for that reason did nearly all the public presses discountenance, condemn, and even ridicule such motley assem-

blages. And but for the repetition of these *amalgamation* meetings, we speak solely now of their being seated promiscuously by the blacks and whites, we doubt whether the Anniversary would have excited the populace to any semblance of a riot. But again and again, in disregard of the private advice of the judicious, and the public rebukes of *every daily paper* in this city, this course, so odious and offensive as it was obviously becoming, was almost nightly repeated; and before any outrage had been committed, it became generally understood in the city, that an attempt was making in the session of the Chatham-street Chapel, to introduce this mingling of colours in the ordinary meetings for worship. Already one or more dining parties had been given for whites and blacks promiscuously, and in several of the churches coloured persons had been introduced into the pews with white people, *volens volens*. Then came the Fourth of July celebration, or rather *desecration*, in which the same offensive course was pursued; and now, for the first time, there were *symptoms of a riot*.

In fact, no sensible or discreet man can be found in the community, unless among the infatuated partizans of the society, who does not regard the services on the 4th of July as a public outrage; however he may condemn the scandalous conduct of the mob, which attempted to resent it by deeds of lawless violence, both at the time, and subsequently. When it is recollected that the day is one of hallowed memory, as the anniversary of our nation's birth, and kept as a political jubilee throughout the length and breadth of the land, what semblance of propriety can be discovered in first reading the Declaration of Independence; and then, in most uncongenial proximity with that noble document, to introduce, as though of kindred character, that insignificant and treasonable production, entitled the "*Declaration of the Anti-Slavery Convention*." It is a political SIN to *name* these declarations *in the same day*, and especially to connect them together, in the hallowed services of our country's Sabbath, as the 4th of July ought to be regarded by every American. The following extracts from this Anti-Slavery Declaration will serve to show both its insignificant and treasonable character.

"We have met together for the achievement of an enterprise, without which, *that of our fathers is incomplete!* and which, for its *magnitude, solemnity, and probable results upon the destiny of the world, as far transcends theirs!* as moral truth does physical force."

"But those, for whose emancipation we are striving,—



constituting at the present time at least one sixth part of our countrymen,—are recognized by the law, and treated by their fellow-beings, as marketable commodities—as goods and chattels—as *brute beasts*; are *plundered* daily of the fruits of their toil without redress; really enjoying no constitutional nor *legal protection* from *licentious* and *murderous* outrages upon their persons; are ruthlessly torn asunder—the tender babe from the arms of its frantic mother—the heart-broken wife from her weeping husband—at the caprice or pleasure of *irresponsible tyrants*. For the *crime of having a dark complexion*, they suffer the pangs of hunger, the infliction of stripes, and the ignominy of brutal servitude. They are kept in *heathenish darkness by laws* expressly enacted to make their instruction a criminal offence.”

“These are the prominent circumstances in the condition of more than two millions of our people, the proof of which may be found in thousands of indisputable facts, and in the *laws of the slave-holding States*.”

“Hence we maintain—that in view of the civil and religious privileges of this nation, the *guilt of its oppression is unequalled by any other on the face of the earth*!”

“It is piracy to buy or steal a native African, and subject him to servitude. Surely the sin is as great to enslave an AMERICAN as an AFRICAN!”

“Therefore we believe and affirm—That there is no difference, *in principle*, between the *African slave trade* and *American slavery* :

“That *every American citizen*, who retains a human being in involuntary bondage as his property, is (according to Scripture) a *man-stealer* !

“That all those *laws* which are *now in force*, admitting the right of slavery, are therefore *before God utterly NULL AND VOID* ; being an audacious usurpation of the Divine prerogative, a daring infringement on the law of Nature, a base overthrow of the very foundations of the social compact, a complete extinction of all the relations, endearments, and obligations of mankind, and a presumptuous transgression of all the holy commandments—and that therefore they ought to be instantly abrogated.”

"We regard, as *delusive, cruel, and dangerous*, any scheme of expatriation which *pretends to aid*, either directly or indirectly, in the emancipation of the slaves, or to be a substitute for the immediate and total abolition of slavery."

"But we maintain that Congress has a right, and is *solemnly bound*, to suppress the domestic slave trade between the several States, and to abolish slavery in those portions of our territory which the Constitution has placed under its exclusive jurisdiction.

"We also maintain that there are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the *people of the free States*, to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States."

"They seize the slave who has escaped into their territories, and send him back to be tortured by an enraged master or a brutal driver. This relation to slavery is criminal and full of danger : *it must be broken up !*"

"We shall organize Anti-Slavery Societies, if possible, in every city, town, and village in our land."

"We shall spare no exertions nor means to bring *the whole nation* to speedy repentance.

"Our trust for victory is solely in GOD. *We* may be *personally defeated*, but our principles *never*?"

The foregoing extracts from this sophistical, dangerous, and Anti-American document, are thus presented to the reader, that he may appreciate the desecration of the day of which the society were guilty in presuming to read such sentiments, in connexion with the Declaration of American Independence; and that no American may be surprised, that the audience refused to hear David Paul Brown, Esq., of Philadelphia, who purposed to pronounce an oration after the reading of that offensive document. And when it is remembered that the audience was made up of all colours, and hundreds of our black population taught to depreciate our national Declaration of Independence, and that this anti-slavery declaration "far transeends" it; could it be expected that on such a day, an American audience would restrain their indignation. All that was done then, was to prevent the delivery of the oration in the most peaceable and effectual manner, and the motley assemblage was dismissed in confusion, while the orator was sent home with his unspoken speech in his pocket.

Still, however, no considerable violence was done to persons or property, although the offensive meetings and Anti-American speeches and publications were continued, in defiance of the tone of remonstrance and rebuke which became louder and louder. Among the most offensive publications, and perhaps one of the prominent causes of the subsequent disturbances of the public peace, was a *handbill* posted through the city, directly inviting *resistance to the laws*, and calculated to rouse the black population to the rescue of some fugitive slaves who were in custody at the suit of their owner, until legal investigation should determine the issue. These handbills bore the motto, "RESISTANCE TO TYRANTS, IS OBEDIENCE TO GOD!" Nor was it, until the subsequent repetition of similar provocations, by an attempted African celebration, and a controversy occurring in relation to the occupancy of that ill-fated building, the Chatham-street Chapel, in which several white men were violently assaulted and beaten by the blacks, that the infuriated populace resented the oft repeated and continued series of such proceedings, by taking the law in their own hands, and inflicting violence upon the property of some of the leaders of the party. Once excited, they were driven to madness, and in their desperation several churches, which had been used for anti-slavery purposes, were stoned and otherwise injured, and many of the coloured people suffered in their property and their churches. Those citizens who were conspicuous in the anti-slavery ranks had to flee the city, and the civil and military authorities had to interpose for the suppression of the riots, and the protection of the peace of the city.

Surely every citizen must feel a personal degradation in these shameful outrages, which nothing can justify, nor even excuse. However exceptionable and even offensive were the meetings of the Anti-slavery Society, however dangerous their principles and mischievous their tendency, yet in a government of laws, the liberty of speech and of the press belongs to every citizen, subject only to the restraints and penalties of the law. Any combination designed by brute force to inflict summary vengeance by a band of outlaws, is to be deprecated as an infinitely greater evil, than the causes which are made the pretext of such enormities. And accordingly, the perpetrators of these deeds of violence, who were arrested in the act, have been already subjected to the penalties of the violated law; and a lesson has been thus taught to those who have escaped detection, which will doubtless deter them from a repetition of such offences.

It is a venerated maxim, that "freedom of opinion may be safely tolerated on any subject, while reason is left free to com-

bat it." And with reference to the doctrines and measures of the Anti-slavery Society, no force is needed but the power of *truth*. We have animadverted freely upon their official publications, believing, as we do, that they contain sentiments which are dangerous to our country in its political, social, and religious relations; and, as we have a right to do, we have attempted to prove that in their zeal for abstract principles, they have committed violence upon the majesty of truth. The public measures they propose are legitimately subject to criticism, as are also all the arguments and means they use to propagate their doctrines.

In exposing the errors they have committed, in detecting the misrepresentations and falsehoods into which they have fallen, and in warning our countrymen of the mischievous and dangerous tendency of this society, which we regard as an Anti-American conspiracy against human rights and human liberty; we have aimed to do no injustice to the society, or to individuals; while at the same time we have fearlessly expressed our sentiments, with the warmth and earnestness which our convictions of truth and duty inspire. And now, in conclusion, we submit to the people of the United States the opinions we entertain on this important subject, with the reasons on which those opinions are founded, which though briefly expressed, are, we hope, sufficiently intelligible. It remains for every American citizen to form his own conclusions as respects his individual duty, whether to favour the doctrine of immediate abolition as a remedy for slavery, without regard to consequences; or to withhold from the Anti-Slavery Society any countenance or patronage. And in the event of the latter conclusion being adopted, as Americans and as Christians, we present to them the American Colonization Society, as being strictly national in its character; supremely benevolent in its designs; wholly peaceable in its measures; and unexceptionable in its tendency;—whether viewed as the only safe and practicable method of promoting the abolition of slavery in this country; or as a plan for the elevation of the coloured race in the land of their forefathers, where the God of nature designed them to be the lords of the soil; or as a means of introducing the lights of Christianity and kindling the fires of civilization upon that continent of heathenism.

While on the other hand, we think that we have shown, that the "American Anti-Slavery Society" is both Anti-American and Anti-Christian in its nature and tendency;—that it is wild, visionary, and Utopian, in proposing to elevate to equality with the whites, a race so long oppressed, degraded, and down-trodden in the dust;—that their schemes and plans are treasonable in their

character, involving the overthrow of our civil institutions, and the dissolution of our national compact;—that they are utterly impracticable, because at war with the laws of the land, as well as with a repugnance deep, universal, and *invincible*; that the means they employ are calculated to engender civil strife, servile war, insurrection, and bloodshed, and already threaten to desolate the hopes, and blast the rising glory of our common country. And while we acquit the originators and promoters of the society of any motive thus to inflict untold evils upon their country, and award to them all that disinterestedness they claim; yet this does not diminish the danger to be apprehended from their doctrines and measures, nor release us from the responsibility of exposing their errors, correcting their mistakes, and, if we may, of preventing their mischiefs. And if in defeating their misguided efforts, it becomes necessary to encounter the men who make them, we may do this, as we have aimed to do, without using carnal weapons, and without feeling any personal rancour or hostility against their persons. We have to do with “principles, not men;” and whether we have succeeded in overthrowing those on which the Anti-slavery fabric is built, is of vastly more importance, than whether the individuals advocating those principles are treated with more or less severity than they merit.

The following important conclusions, are those to which the author would fain hope that this review may lead the minds of his readers, if, as he humbly conceives, he has established their justice and propriety, viz.:—

1st. The *American* Anti-slavery Society, is so called by a misnomer, since its name and character are alike *Anti-American*.

2d. In the 2d article of its constitution, the society audaciously usurps the supreme legislative, judicial, and executive authority of this nation, in declaring the exercise of the legally constituted right of slave-holding, to be a “*heinous crime in the sight of God*,” thus presuming to decide, in the language of their famous “Declaration,” that “all those *laws* which are *now in force* admitting the right of slavery, are therefore, *before God*, utterly *null and void*!” which is equivalent to an affirmation that *nullification* would be a *virtue* “before God,” and *rebellion* on the part of the slaves, a *Christian duty*!

3d. The measures proposed for the removal of the natural *repugnance* between the races, which is called *prejudice*, aiming at the elevation of the coloured population to political and do

mestic "equality with the whites," in "*all* our happy institutions" which are "open to others!" and avowing a purpose to effect this elevation while they *remain among us*; necessarily includes an incorporation of the races by the most offensive form of amalgamation, however such design may be disavowed.

4th. That to attempt to brand the characters of any portion of our fellow citizens with the crimes of *robbery, piracy, and murder*, for an act recognized as a civil right by the Constitution of the Union, and the uninterrupted possession and exercise of which, is guarantied by the laws of the land, is, in itself, virtual treason before God and man; and must inevitably tend to *disaffect* the independent sovereignties of these states, *alienate* the affections of southern Christians from their brethren, *unsettle* the foundations of our Union, and involve this nation in the horrors of a *civil rebellion*, if not in the bloody tragedy of a *servile war*!

5th. That the attempt to propagate such doctrines in any part of this Union, by the agency of *foreign emissaries*, and especially the inculcation of such sentiments under the garb of our holy religion, as though countenanced by its divine precepts is a high and grievous offence, alike against patriotism and Christianity; and ought to be every where peaceably, but steadily and efficiently, opposed by every lover of his country, and especially by every friend of our common Christianity.

6th. That the abolition of slavery from this land, depending, as it does, according to the Constitution, *solely* upon the *will of the South*, and the *voluntary* action of southern legislatures, all interference, or even the semblance of dictation, on the part of individuals in the North, and especially by an organized body of citizens in any of the free states, is to be deprecated as a public calamity. Experience demonstrates that it cannot fail to retard, if it does not utterly prevent the extinguishment of slavery in the country, while such an organization must inflict unutterable mischiefs upon the coloured people themselves, whether free or enslaved.

7th. As therefore the tendencies of this "American Anti-Slavery Society" and its publications, are now so apparent, and its brief history has exhibited no other results than inflaming the public mind; increasing the *prejudice* which it professes to remove; magnifying the evils of slavery by provoking to rigorous enactments, and individual severities; diminishing the brightening prospects of the cause of emancipation, and overthrowing the

hopes of its friends; it is plain that "the duty, interests, and safety of all concerned, require its *immediate* abandonment."

8th. That even on the supposition that the cause of abolition in the slave states, might be promoted by any moral efforts made at the North, the heads and hearts of those who have been engaged in this American Anti-Slavery Society, are demonstrably unfit to participate in a cause, upon which their rash impetuosity and intemperate declamation has already inflicted so deep a wound. If therefore any thing can be done in the free states, to aid our southern brethren to "break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free;" it is now certain that these are not the men, nor theirs the means for such an enterprise.

9th. That the abolition of slavery, and the elevation of our coloured population, are objects so vast in extent and importance, that nothing can be done in the promotion of either by sudden, rash, or violent means; but must be peacefully attempted, and if ever attained, it must be by *gradual* efforts, consistent with the public sentiment and clearly compatible with the public safety.

10th. That the American Colonization Society is, therefore, strictly speaking, the *only* "AMERICAN Anti-Slavery Society" in existence, for while it disclaims all interference with vested or constitutional rights, and proposes a direct action, only upon the "free people of colour," and this, only "with their own consent;" it does nevertheless promote and encourage the voluntary emancipation of the slaves to an extent, unequalled in the whole history of abolition societies, and without a parallel in ancient or modern times.

If these conclusions, thus briefly enumerated, be legitimately drawn from the present examination of the pamphlet under notice, and it appears to the author, that no sophistry can evade them, the whole is respectfully submitted to American citizens, and American Christians, with the fervent desire that it may be useful at the present crisis, and subserve the interests of patriotism, philanthropy, and religion, which may be justly regarded as strictly identical.

FINIS.













